UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,963	06/30/2006	Kai Lehtonen	AWEK 3491	3163
	7590 03/17/200 AND BEDELL, P.C.	EXAMINER		
16100 NW COI	RNELL ROAD, SUITI	KIM, CHRISTOPHER S		
BEAVERTON, OR 97006			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3752	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/17/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/596,963	LEHTONEN, KAI			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Christopher S. Kim	3752			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	l. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 Ju	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 17-33 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 17-33 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ access	vn from consideration. r election requirement. r. epted or b) □ objected to by the B				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		• •			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/17/06.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	te			

Art Unit: 3752

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

- 1. The information disclosure statement filed July 17, 2006 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.
- 2. Applicant indicated that MPEP609 requirement for a concise explanation of relevance of DE 196 12 738 is met because the document was cited in the International Search Report. The information disclosure statement filed July 17, 2006 fails to comply with MPEP 609.04(a)III because it does not include an English-language version of the search report. No search report in English or foreign language can be found in the information disclosure statement.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claims 17-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

Claim 17 recites the limitation "the first end" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 17 recites the limitation "the fuel primarily entering" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 17 recites the limitation "the second end" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 17 recites the limitation "the fuel primarily leaving" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 17 recites the limitation "the fuel entering" in line 11. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 17 recites the limitation "the first direction" in line 13. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 17 recites the limitation "the second direction" in lines 13-14. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. See MPEP § 2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat.

Art Unit: 3752

App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 18 recites the broad recitation "said piston", and the claim also recites "i.e., the first piston" which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

Claim 18 recites the limitation "the first piston" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

The claims are replete with indefiniteness under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Above is an exemplary listing. Applicant is required to review and amend all of the claims in their entirety to ensure full compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claim 30 is directed to a method but fails to identify any method steps.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 3752

6. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Koch (5,645,224).

Koch discloses a device comprising:

a body 14;

a chamber having:

a first main volume 44;

a second main volume 52;

a first channel 38;

a second channel 22;

a movable piston 26;

at least one auxiliary volume 48, 58

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher S. Kim whose telephone number is (571) 272-4905. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Len Tran can be reached on (571) 272-1184. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3752

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christopher S. Kim/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3752

CK